



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/719,290 | 12/07/2000 | Rajendra Kumar | KHY.P.US0051 | 6236 |
| 21324 | 7590 | 09/20/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP | | | NGUYEN, HUY D | |
| One GOJO Plaza | | | ART UNIT | |
| Suite 300 | | | PAPER NUMBER | |
| AKRON, OH 44311-1076 | | | 2681 | |

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/719,290

Applicant(s)

KUMAR, RAJENDRA

Examiner

Huy D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grewe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,673) in view of Jones, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,334) and in further view of Lebby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,069,593).

Regarding claims 1-2, 4, 8, 10-13, 17, 20-21, 23, 25, Grewe et al. disclose a portable processing device comprising: a detachable handset unit sized for handheld grasping (e.g. cellular telephone, col. 1, line 62) and including a central processor and a plurality of first circuits (cell phone inherently includes processor and circuits), processor controlling the operation of first circuits; a portable docking display unit including a first display and a plurality of second circuits (e.g. PDA 10, col. 2, line 30); and, processor controlling the operation of at least one-of-second circuits and first display when detachable handset unit is docked with docking display unit (e.g. the PDA is combined with the cell phone to form a single integrated apparatus, col. 1, lines 61-64). Grewe et al. do not clearly teach that the portable docking display unit is dimensioned to receive docking of detachable handset unit. Jones, Jr. teaches a multi-positional PDA handset configuration wherein the handset can be secured during travel (Figs. 1-3; Col. 4, lines 2-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the display unit of Grewe et al. with a handset configuration as

Art Unit: 2681

taught by Jones, Jr. for the purpose of securing the handset to the docking display unit during travel.

The combination of Grewe et al. and Jones, Jr. fails to teach that said plurality of second circuits not including a central processor, and said central processor controls the operation of at least one of said second circuits and said first display when said detachable handset unit is docked with said docking display unit. However, the preceding limitations are taught in Lebby et al. (see figure 3 and column 4, lines 38-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Lebby et al. to the teaching of Grewe et al. and Jones, Jr. to provide for a detachable display carrier that has housed therein a plurality of displays and to provide for a new and improved electronic display control of a plurality of displays of a portable electronic device.

Regarding claim 3, the combination also teaches a device, as in claim 2, wherein said control signals are coupled by means of first electrical connector provided on the detachable handset unit and said portable docking display unit further includes a second electrical connector (e.g. connector 14, Grewe et al. Col. 2, line 34) for removably engaging first electrical connector (e.g. connector 24, Grewe et al. Col. 2, line 37) when detachable handset unit and portable docking display unit are docked (Grewe et al. - col. 2, lines 49-51).

Regarding claim 5, the combination also teaches a device, as in claim 1, wherein docking display unit further includes a communication circuit (Grewe et al. Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Grewe et al., Jones, Jr., and Lebby et al. teaches a device, as set forth in claim 1, wherein said docking display unit includes a display which is larger than a display associated with the detachable handset (see Jones, Jr., figures 1, 3-4).

Art Unit: 2681

Regarding claims 9 and 24 the combination of Grewe et al., Jones, Jr., and Lebby et al. does not teach that the docking display unit is mounted in a vehicle. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have the docking display unit mounted in a vehicle since the invention would perform equally well regardless where the docking display unit is mounted.

Regarding claim 16, the combination does not teach that the handset includes a GPS receiver. The examiner takes Official Notice that GPS is very well known in the art for monitoring the position of an object. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the handset of the combination a GPS receiver as is well known in the art to help locate the handset easily.

Regarding claims 18-19, the combination of Grewe et al., Jones, Jr., and Lebby et al. does not teach that the docking display is configured as a clam shell unit. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to configure the docking display since it appears the invention would perform equally well with the docking display configured as a clam shell unit.

Regarding claim 22, the combination of Grewe et al., Jones, Jr., and Lebby et al. does not teach that the interface signals from at least two interfaces are multiplexed. The examiner takes Official Notice that multiplexing is well known in the art for transmitting two or more signals using only one channel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use multiplexing as is well known in the art to save resource.

Art Unit: 2681

3. Claims 6, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grewe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,673) in view of Jones, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,673) and further view of Lebby et al. and still further view of Pardo (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,539).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Grewe et al., Jones, Jr., and Lebby et al. does not include in the docking display a speaker and a microphone. Pardo discloses a PDA that has a speaker and a microphone (col. 9, lines 28-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the PDA of Grewe et al. in view of Jones, Jr. and Lebby et al. a speaker and a microphone as disclosed in Pardo so that users can have their choice of using either the handset or the PDA for voice communication.

Regarding claim 15, the combination Grewe et al., Jones, Jr., Lebby et al., and Pardo also teaches that data exchange is enabled through infrared interface (Pardo - col. 11, lines 23-25).

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2681

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7845. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Huy Nguyen



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER